

# **CALIFORNIA CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION**

**Thursday, June 21<sup>st</sup>, 2001  
Hiram W. Johnson State Building  
Auditorium  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102**

## **I. Call to Order.**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Rob Reiner at 8:50 a.m.

## **II. Roll Call.**

Present were Commissioners Kim Belshe, Sandra Gutierrez, Susan Lacey, Louis Vismara, Karen Hill-Scott, Ed Melia, Theresa Garcia and Chairman Reiner.

## **III. Approval of Minutes, May 17, 2001 State Commission Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Vismara moved, seconded by Chairman Reiner to approve the May 17, 2001 minutes. The motion passed unanimously with the following addition: on page 8 regarding the FY 2001-02 State Budget, Commissioner Belshe requested that the minutes be amended with the following: Concerning the first principle, that the use of any Proposition 10 funds in the budget be clearly aligned with the priorities of the State and County Commissions and consistent with the mission of proposition 10; and under the third principle, that funding be one-time only and not be used to fund baseline programs or caseload growth.

## **IV. Chairman's Report**

Chairman Reiner reported that he had presented at the Maternal and Child Health Conference and the Festiva de la Educativa. The press release date for the Kit for New Parents will be in September in an effort to include celebrities to maximize the attention for it. Kits can be made available prior to September through Kristina Schake or Nicole Kasabian. The review committee for the new ad campaign is in the research phase and the initial concepts of the campaign are being focus tested on our target audiences. All of the current advertisements will remain on through July. Chairman Reiner reported that several members of the Committee on Diversity are participating on the State Commission's Master Plan for School Readiness and in workgroups developing the Commission's School Readiness initiative Request for Funds (RFF). Chairman Reiner read a letter from the Commission to Dr. Ed Melia, who will be retiring and resigning from the Commission effective the end of July 2001, thanking him for his contribution to

the growth and development of Proposition 10.

## **V. Executive Director's Report**

Jane Henderson reported that there is a new Legislative link on the Commission's web site ([www.cafc.ca.gov](http://www.cafc.ca.gov)). Executive Director Henderson discussed evaluation of the School Readiness Initiative as well as the County Commissions' annual reporting of results. An RFP to obtain the services of a contractor has been proposed for July, with a goal of creating an expanded design for the County Commissions' annual reports and indicators designing the evaluation for, the School Readiness Initiative, providing technical assistance developing, data collection tools, and assembling the information for presentation to the Legislature and the Governor. Dr. Henderson reported that the principal investigator of the Health Linkages Project had resigned and she also discussed contracting issues. This project is currently on hold and the State Commission is searching for a new home for the project. The School of Family Health Care Nursing at UCSF is interested in taking on the project. On May 22, 2001, the State and Consumer Services Agency released a review of the State's Childcare Fiscal Policy in California. Dr. Henderson presented an overview of a report by the State and Consumer Services Agency, which reviewed state childcare and fiscal policy in California. The report focused on childcare policy and resources in the area of CalWORKs and focused on the following areas:

- 1) Inequitable availability of childcare openings for working poor families.
- 2) The demand for subsidized childcare for CalWORKs families is growing exponentially.

Also discussed were ways of dealing with the perceived inequities within existing and available resources, including age eligibility, income eligibility, time limits for families on CalWORKs, fees charged to families and subsidy levels. In-depth hearings and discussions on these issues will be held by the Legislature during their interim recess and any resulting legislation will be introduced in the next session.

## **VI. Report from the California Children and Families Association**

Dorinda Ohnstad announced the one-year anniversary of the association. She then explained the joint process for the development of the policies and criteria for the School Readiness initiative. She commended the State Commission and county commissions for their commitment to the mission of Proposition 10 in this collaborative effort.

## **II Preparation of CCFC's Budget**

Joe Munso presented additional information to the written material provided, which detailed staff recommendations related to several projects and proposed next steps for utilizing the budget calendar. Staff recommended that they bring back the FY 01-02, 02-03 and the 03-04 process for further review of these issues in the fall. Mr. Munso noted that issue related to oral health program proposals, the Central Valley partnership project, the Inclusion Project, the Immunization Project and Prenatal Care are pending. He suggested that the Commission direct staff to prioritize and form funding concepts for these items for future presentation.

Executive Director Henderson stressed that medical experts should be brought in to discuss the health related projects and to assist in creating concepts and staff direction.

The Commissioners had a procedural deliberation, discussing the development of standards for proposals and the subsequent funding of proposals.

### **Public Comment**

Dave Bonfilio, from the Marin County Commission, echoed the comments of Commissioner Karen Hill-Scott. Mr. Bonfilio identified the need to identify which programs merit funding. These problems exist at the county level as well.

Mickey Richie, State Department of Health Services, spoke in support of unsolicited proposals. There have been discussions in which unsolicited proposals have been requested. If the Commission does not want proposals it should make that clear so that those people sharing the passion of the Commission can be on the same page. Ms. Richie spoke in support of statewide immunization.

Kate Ertz-Berger spoke in support of the retention program and the inclusion program.

John Siegel, Trinity County, asked for clarification on the \$200,000 for minimum allocation. Mr. Munso stated that this would be in effect until 2002 if approved. Mr. Siegel stated that his commission arrived at the figure of \$400,000.

Mark Friedman, Alameda County, suggested the development of a more systematic framework that could be called the School Readiness Grant Program.

## **VIII. May Revision of the FY 2001/2002 State Budget**

Joe Munso presented this item. Mr. Munso revisited topics discussed at the last Commission meeting. In the past month, staff has written a letter to the Governor's Office expressing the concerns that were raised during the last Commission meeting. The American Cancer Society has also written a letter opposing the use of Prop 10 money to

fund state programs. The CCAFA has written similar letters. It is still in the version that the Assembly and Senate Conference Committee is dealing with in terms of the budget. The Commission's concerns with the proposal have been made clear. The constituency has also expressed their concerns. It is now up to the Commission to take formal action. The overall budget situation has gotten worse since the Commission last met.

Motion: Chairman Reiner moved to take a formal position of "oppose" on the proposal in the May Revise letter to transfer \$30 million from the State Commission budget.

Commissioner Belshe spoke in support of a formal position of "oppose" on the proposal in the May Revise.

#### Public Comment

Dorinda Ohnstad spoke in support of the Commission's taking a formal position of opposition.

Vote: The Commission voted to adopt a formal position of "oppose" on the proposal in the May Revise. The vote was unanimous.

### **IX. Matching Funds for Retention Incentives for Early Care and Education Providers**

Emily Nahat presented this action item. This funding proposal is for State Commission approval of \$18 million in state matching funds plus \$1.8 million for evaluation for FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03 to complete the three-year Matching Funds for Retention Incentives for Early Care and Education Providers Pilot Project. The State Commission investment would leverage approximately \$63 million in local funds over two years for a total program budget of over \$80 million.

During FY 2000-01, 14 counties participated in the Project. Should the State Commission wish to only continue funding the existing participating counties, the cost would be approximately \$8 million plus \$0.8 million for evaluation for FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03.

Intent to Apply forms indicates that an additional 32 counties will join the initiative during FY 2001-2002 and FY 2002-03.

Chair Reiner asked how the childcare work force will be stabilized beyond the two years proposed. Ms. Nahat informed the Commission that the evaluation component of this proposal will be useful in answering that question.

Commissioner Belshe asked for clarification on the type of incentives being offered. Ms. Nahat informed the Commission that the majority of incentives are in the form of stipends. Commissioner Belshe inquired about other types of incentives. Ms. Nahat

described several other incentive methods.

Commissioner Vismara asked what information will be available at the end of the second year of the project and what additional information will be gained by another year of funding. Ms. Nahat informed the Commission that it will take this extra time in order for each of the counties to have at least two years participation.

Commissioner Vismara asked for clarification on the purposes of this project. Ms Nahat explained that there are multiple purposes of this project. One purpose is to address the need to retain childcare providers and reduce turnover. Another is to improve quality.

Commissioner Gutierrez noted that this proposal is not an end all solution to the problem, but rather a step towards a permanent solution. Commissioner Gutierrez expressed concerns about the Commission being perceived as the total solution to the problem.

Emily Nahat noted that this is a pilot research project and that more work needs to be done to find a long-term solution.

Commissioner Vismara suggested focusing the evaluation component on next step solutions using the data.

#### Public Comment

Caroline Manson, San Francisco CARES Program Director, thanked the State and local Commissions for this initiative. Ms. Manson presented anecdotal public support for this initiative. Ms. Manson presented components of the San Francisco CARES program. Ms. Manson suggested that compensation and retention be addressed in the context of the School Readiness initiative as well.

Kate Ertz-Berger, Contra Costa Child Care Resource and Referral Center, spoke in support of the initiative. The Contra Costa Child Care Resource and Referral Center recently received a small grant from the Quality for Child Care Initiative and will be launching a media advocacy campaign over the next year with the goal of building support for child care workers.

Don Humphries, Executive Director, Siskiyou County CFC, spoke in support of this program. Mr. Humphries noted that this is an important way to express the fact that someone cares.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Belshe moved, seconded by Commissioner Gutierrez to approve \$18 million in state matching funds plus \$1.8 million for evaluation for FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03 to complete the three-year Matching Funds for Retention Incentives for Early Care and Education Providers Pilot Project. The motion passed unanimously.

## **X. Legislation**

Patti Huston presented this action item.

AB 1105 (Simitian and Shelley) – Child Care Assistance for Foster Families. This bill was brought back before the Commission to address concerns raised by the Commission at the last meeting. The first concern was the exclusion of foster family agencies from the bill. Ms. Huston informed the Commission that the reason they were not included in this bill is because of the great expense of doing so: the cost of the bill would be increased threefold. There are 11 foster care bills in the package totaling approximately \$50 million. AB 557 and AB 636 were both identified by Ms. Huston as additional foster care-related bills that fall within the goals and objectives of the Commission. Ms. Huston offered to bring analyses on these bills before the Commission for it to take a formal position.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Belshe moved, seconded by Commissioner Lacey to take a formal position of support for bill AB 1105 (Simitian and Shelley). The motion passed unanimously.

SB 1038 (Polanco) – Healthy Families: Vaccines. This bill would enact the California Healthy Families Vaccine Purchase Act. It would allow the Healthy Families Program to participate in the federal discounted bulk purchase of childhood vaccines. Ms. Huston was asked at the May 2001 Commission meeting to bring this bill back before the Commission with more information about the Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board (MRMIB). Ms. Huston was asked to determine whether or not the new vaccine program would be a disincentive for prospective providers to participate in the Healthy Families Program. MRMIB has not yet completed its meetings with physicians and medical groups on this point. Ms. Huston recommended that the Commission hold off on taking a formal position until MRMIB has completed its meetings.

### Public Comment

Steve Barrow, Co-Chair, California Coalition for Childhood Immunization, spoke in support of the bill. Mr. Barrow, on behalf of the Coalition, strongly requested that the Commission not table this item and take a formal position of support on this bill.

Commissioner Belshe recommended the Commission table the item for one month. If MRMIB does not come back with a definitive position on this point, then the Commission should take a formal position of support at that time.

Commissioner Vismara asked if the managed care groups were a major problem in terms of reimbursements to the physicians. Ms. Huston reported that the answer to this specific question is not known.

SB 312 (Alpert) – Cigarette and Tobacco Taxes: Returned Products. This bill would codify the distributors’ method of refunding tax on returned tobacco products by allowing them to net the tax on returned products against the tax liability. This bill is intended to provide clear statutory authority for the current method of refunding tax on returned tobacco products. Ms. Huston provided this bill to the Commission for information only.

AB 734 (Chan) – California Children and Families Commission Funds. Ms. Huston informed the Commission that this State Commission-sponsored bill has moved to the Senate. Ms. Huston will report further on this bill at the next Commission meeting.

AB 735 (Chan) – County Children and Families Commissions – Conflict of Interest. Ms. Huston reported that this bill is on its way to the Senate for a final vote before proceeding to the Governor. There has not been a single dissenting vote on this bill.

## **XI. Kit for New Parents Evaluation Proposal**

Nicole Kasabian presented this discussion item. The purpose of this evaluation is to document the distribution and use of the Kit for New Parents throughout California and its impact on parents and providers during a two-year period. The Kit is expected to improve parents’ knowledge, confidence and practices as well as the knowledge and practices of providers who serve them. The evaluation is intended to assess whether these outcomes were achieved during the program’s first two years. The estimated cost of this evaluation is \$1.8 million. Ms. Kasabian introduced Dr. Linda Neuhauser of the UC Berkeley Community Wellness Center. Ms. Neuhauser presented her work to the Commission.

Ms. Neuhauser presented a recap of the evaluation to this point. The following is a summary of Ms. Neuhauser’s presentation.

The evaluation is designed to answer the following key questions:

1. How do parents use the Kit?
2. What is the impact of the Kit on parents and children?
3. What is the impact of the Kit on health and early childhood providers?
4. How is the Kit distributed statewide and what are “best practices?”

The main elements of the work plan are to:

- Examine longitudinally the use of the Kit by parents who represent the diversity of Californians (geography, race, socio-economic status and disability) and who receive the Kit through a variety of programs.
- Compare knowledge, confidence and practices of parents who receive the Kit with similar parents who do not.

- Qualitatively assess providers' knowledge and use of the Kit in major distribution venues. Qualitatively assess parents' in-depth Kit use, satisfaction and changes.
- Track the distribution of the Kit in all participating counties: number of Kits distributed, demographics of recipients, methods of distribution, issues and recommendations for improvement. Assess the process and effectiveness of the training activities.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked if all sample groupings would be applied to both English and Spanish speakers. Dr. Neuhauser stated that there would be appropriate over-sampling to get statistically meaningful data.

Chairman Reiner asked how many people are planned to be in the control group. Dr. Neuhauser stated that this information would be coming from the statistician at UCLA, however, she estimated the number to be 900. Chairman Reiner expressed concerns about people needing the kit and not getting it because they are in the control group.

Commissioner Hill-Scott asked how many questions will be asked in the statewide sample of parents. Dr. Neuhauser stated that there would be similar to that done in the pilot study, but would have the addition of parents out to 1 year. Commissioner Hill-Scott expressed concerns over the budget amount, i.e., would there be enough to complete the program.

Chairman Reiner asked if there were any potential partners expressing interest. Joe Munso informed the Commission that there may be some Medi-Cal dollars available.

Commissioner Melia noted that the kits will be used in school-based programs and that health and social services may provide help with the evaluation component.

Commissioner Belshe asked how regions are being defined. Nicole Kasabian explained that the regions would be laid out similar to those defined by the Commission.

Commissioner Vismara asked when the advisory panel will be formed. Dr. Neuhauser stated that the panel would be formed upon approval of the Commission.

Chairman Reiner introduced Assemblymember Wilma Chan to the Commission and audience. Assemblymember Chan shared some of her thoughts on the work of the Commission and offered to help advance the work of the Commission in any way possible. Chairman Reiner expressed concerns over the lack of education about the work of the Commission with respect to the Assemblymember's colleagues. Assemblymember Chan suggested that a hearing could be convened and that it would be well attended. The hearing would serve to educate her colleagues on the importance of the work of the State and County Commissions. Chairman Reiner stated that the Commission needs partners to continue to move forward in the most effective manner possible.



Chairman Reiner excused himself from the remainder of the meeting. Commissioner Lacey conducted the remainder of the meeting.

## **XII. School Readiness Initiative**

Jane Henderson made a power-point presentation on the design and development of the initiative highlighting the following topics.

### **CCFC School Readiness Planning Groups**

Fiscal

Criteria/Eligibility

Evaluation

Technical Assistance

Representatives:

County Commissioners and Executive Directors

Advisory Committee on Diversity

CCFC Staff

### **“Launch” Timeline**

Tier 1 RFF out August 2001

Start November 2001

Tier 2 Intent to Participate-December 2001

RFF out December 2001

Start July 2002

Tier 3 RFF out December 2002

Start July 2203

### **Fiscal Sub-Group Recommendations**

How should we disburse funds to counties?

Use allocations to determine an individual county's share

When would disbursements start?

July 2001

How much will we allocate?

\$200 million over 4 years

How should we allocate the funds?

Use a formula that allocates funds based on the blending of county birth rates and the number of students in schools in deciles 1-3 (API)

Will we provide implementation grants?

Provide up to \$100K per year out of allocation with no local match required

Will there be a county match?

Yes – counties will need to provide a 1:1 match (lesser match as incentive for Tier 1 sites until July 1, 2002 – 50%)

Where can county match come from?

Any source as long as it is a cash commitment

**Target Communities**

Communities served by schools with Academic Performance Index (API) in Deciles 1-3

Estimate: 1385 schools

Over 800,000 children

85% low income

48% English Language Learners

**Overall 'SR' Principles**

Voluntary family participation

Family focus and decision-making

Community investment and design

Inclusive and culturally competent

Addresses needs of children with disabilities and other special needs

Collaboration

Builds on family and community assets

Coordinates existing services and infrastructure

School based or linked

Plan with connected assessment, prioritized goals, strategies, partners, and evaluation (based on disaggregated data)

Comprehensive training

Results based accountability and strong evaluation component

Systems Integration and redesign

Standards and research based, plus 'promising practices'

**5 Essential (and Coordinated) Elements for School Readiness**

1. Children's Readiness for School
2. Parenting/Family Support
3. Health and Social Services
4. Schools' Readiness for Children
5. Site Infrastructure, Evaluation, and Administration

**Criteria/Eligibility Sub-Group Recommendations**

Drafted documents to support Principles, Processes, and 5 Essential Elements:

RFF Matching Funds Grant Application Narrative – Tier 1

Review Criteria – County Self-Assessment and Review/Selection Criteria (Tier 1,2,3)

Also drafted:

Very Preliminary Service levels and Criteria for 5 Essential Elements

Review/Selection Process

**Evaluation Sub-Group Recommendations**

RFP issued in July to develop Evaluation Contract for the following deliverables by December 2001:

Process Evaluation Design

- Impact Evaluation Design
- Continued development of county Results and Indicators (Annual Report) with participating counties
- Implementation of School Readiness Evaluation Design will be informed by:
  - Work of other states and countries on SR
  - National efforts on all 3 components of National Education Goals Panel definition of SR
  - Experiences of Tier 1 counties
- All participating counties need to agree to participate in SR evaluation and research
- TA will be provided to all counties
- SR indicators and process ultimately will be integrated into overall County Commission evaluation
- Evaluation design to be completed by contractor by December 2001

### **Technical Assistance Sub-Group Recommendations**

- Use the 'Principles' approved by this group and the Advisory Committee on Diversity
- Design a TA delivery system to meet the needs of Tier 1 sites and to set a framework for long-term TA needs of all counties
- Ask State Commission to contract with TA consultants to oversee TA delivery on a regional basis
- State TA will focus on operational assistance, cultural sensitivity, language acquisition and reading readiness, integrated service deliver, quality criteria, sustainability, etc.
- Ask State Commission to create a list of screened TA providers to assist counties in obtaining quality TA on a county, regional, or statewide basis
- State Commission and Association will continue to coordinate TA for all counties

### **Next Steps**

- Review and discuss with:
  - Advisory Committee on Diversity (June 29)
  - SR Advisory Committee (TBD)
- Draft RFF with policy and quality criteria to CCFC for review (ahead of July 19 meeting)
- RFF Information Meetings for County Commissions and Local Partners (July and August)

Commissioner Vismara asked how Sonoma State and San Francisco State will be involved in this process. Jane Henderson informed the Commission that they will be part of a cadre of experts that will be providing technical assistance.

Commissioner Garcia asked if staff has considered leveraging a report of some type in connection with school readiness. Jane Henderson advised the Commission that staff is aware of this issue.

Commissioner Belshe asked for clarification on eligibility. Jane Henderson explained that this is a targeted program. Equitable distribution of funds was also a factor in eligibility determination.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked if the Commission would be prescribing what exact services should be available. Commissioner Gutierrez also asked if there has been discussion about a regional approach to distribution of funds. Dr.. Henderson informed the Commission that the program is based on the five essential components, but there is some flexibility in achieving those five elements. With respect to the second question, at present, it appears that only those counties with low performing schools would be involved in this program. .

Commissioner Melia asked how the Commission could ensure that TA will be provided where it is needed. Dr. Henderson explained that there will be a matrix of best practices that will be offered.

#### Public Comment

Dorinda Ohnstad made the point that TA centers will help counties that are just now coming online and implementing programs. Ms. Ohnstad's second point was that counties are true partners in this program as seen in the dollar for dollar matching.

Don Humphries, Siskiyou County, spoke in support of this program. Mr. Humphries identified this as an opportunity to ensure a team mentality amongst the various counties in California. He identified the potential for 17 counties to be left out of this program. There are counties with readiness issues that do not fit the current rubric for eligibility.

John Siegel echoed the opinions of the previous speaker. Mr. Siegel suggested allocating funds for schools that are not low performing in order to keep them at the levels at which they are currently performing.

Commissioner Gutierrez offered thanks to Roberta Peck for her work. Commissioner Gutierrez also spoke in support of funding those 17 counties that did not fit into the current rubric

### **XIII. Master Plan for Education, School Readiness Component**

Commissioner Lacey spoke very briefly on this discussion item, stating that there would be further discussion at the next meeting. Jane Henderson noted that subgroups have been formed to address childcare in an inclusive manner, addressing issues of access and equity, building a system, maintaining the system, assigning responsibility and building collaboration.

#### **XIV. Inclusive Child Care Research Study**

Carmen Padilla introduced Pamm Shaw. Ms. Shaw presented this discussion item and showed a video clip on this topic. This was a qualitative study to assess the state of childcare in the state of California. The study focused specifically on the childcare issues for children with disabilities and other special needs. It was found that these issues are difficult to separate from other childcare issues. Ms. Shaw shared some anecdotal experience. The study identified the number of children in the state with special needs. There are 58,357 children between the ages of birth and 5 years that fit that description. These are the children that have gone through an extensive process to become eligible for services. Statistics were used to identify numbers of children with disabilities. The study also used a random survey of childcare providers to assess the numbers. Childcare providers reported roughly 20% of the children being cared for fit the description of children with disabilities or other special needs. The study identified “gate keepers”, these were services that, once deployed, hindered or prevented access to another service. The number one barrier to access was found to be lack of knowledge of the laws with respect to childcare and children with disabilities and other special needs. Another barrier identified is a lack of knowledge about the available resources. There was no comparison made between the difficulty experienced in accessing child care for children with disabilities and those without. The study recommends collaboration between bodies that are working independently toward the same end.

There will be quantitative data in the final report.

Commissioner Vismara asked if the study looked at attitudes of parents with children without disabilities or special needs towards this issue. Ms. Shaw replied that the study did not address this question.

#### **XV Adjournment**